UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,040	05/21/1999	PHILIP W GILLIS	2925-0224/GI	7281

30594   7590   03/25/2003

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER
DAS, CHAMELI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/361,040	MURDIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C.DAS	2122	(handwritten)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 February 2003</u> .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-15,17-54 and 57-65* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-15,17-54 and 57-65* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

1.   This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed on 2/3/03.

2.   Claims 1-2, 4-15, 17, 19-22, 26-34, 36-37, 39-43, 48, 50-54, 57, 59, 61 and 65 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell, II (Tidwell), US 5,859,637

in view of Linnett et al (Linnett), US 5,301,326.

3.   Claims 63-64 are rejected over Tidwell (US 5,859,637) and Linnett (US 5,301,326) and

further in view of Batch et al (Batch), US 5,423,023.

4.   Claims 3, 18, 23-25, 35, 38, 44-47, 49, 58, 60, 62 are rejected over Tidwell (US

5,859,637), Linnett (US 5,301,326 and further in view of Sonnenreich (US 5,974,446).

5.   Claim 16, 55 and 56 were canceled.

6.   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

        The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

        Claims 1-2, 4-15, 17, 19-22, 26-34, 36-37, 39-43, 48, 50-54, 57, 59, 61, 65 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell, II (Tidwell), US 5,859,637 in view

of Linnett et al (Linnett), US 5,301,326.

As per claim 1, Tidwell discloses:

    - a method for creating a wizard (column 2 line 48, "The present invention is a **method** for **creating a wizards**")

    - prompting input (column 6 line 21-22,"programmable means for said SmartGuides to **prompt said user for input**")

    - process steps and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the process steps (column 4 line 18-59, "Here's an entry field ... The <dataentry> fields create boxes for the user to enter input to the application (409)"), if the user enters "name", there are several selections associated with the each input

    - using the process steps and associated potential selections to create a wizard as claimed (column 2 line 48-60, "The present invention in a method for **creating wizards** using a script-like language that supports a **predetermined set of commands** ... user interface to the user") and (column 2 line 25-30, "It is an object of the invention to present an intuitive, easy to use method of creating wizards such that a person familiar with the user interface of the application program and able to understand a finite set of English-like commands is able to create the wizard using this predetermined set of commands"), where the predetermined set of commands are process steps and associated potential selection.

    Tidwell does not specifically disclose storing the input processes and output is based upon input selections.

However Linnett discloses storing the input processes and output is based upon input

selections (column 9 line 32-33, "**collecting user input relating to the specialized task** to be

performed") and (column 9 line 36-38, "selecting commands to effect the performance of the

specialized task by the application computer program **based on the collected user input**"),

where collecting user input relating to the specialized task is considered as **storing the input**

process and the performance of the socialized task is considered as the output which is based on

the collected input. The specialized task is performed by the interface program which is a wizard

is shown in (column 2 line 32-34, "It is another object of the present invention to provide an

interface program that has expert knowledge relating to the performance of a specialized task")

and (column 3 line 10-11, "**An interface program is referred to as a wizard**").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Linnett into the method of Tidwell to store

the input processes and create the output based upon the input. The modification would be

obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to provide an efficient tool and

allows third parties to extend and customize the feature of an existing application program

(column 2 line 28-30).

Claim 36 is a computer usable medium claim corresponding to the method claim 1 and

rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 2, 37 and 48, Tidwell discloses:

> *- prompting is performed by a displayed template* (Figure 4A, 4B and 4C)

As per claim 4, Tidwell discloses:

> *- input of a designation is further prompted, associating a potential selection with a subsequent process steps* (Fig 4B and Fig 4C), where for a input some potential selections are associated with these input which are displayed in the windows.

Tidwell does not specifically disclose storing the input processes. However Linnett discloses storing the input processes (column 9 line 32-33, "**collecting user input relating to the specialized task** to be performed"), where the specialized task is performed by the interface program which is a wizard (column 2 line 32-34) and , "(column 3 line 10-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Linnett into the method of Tidwell to store the input processes. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to provide an efficient wizard.

As per claims 4, 26, 39 and 50, Tidwell discloses:

> *- input of a designation is further prompted, associating a potential selection as claimed* (column 4 line 10-60).

As per claim 5 and 27, Tidwell discloses:

> *- potential selections permits input of a character string* (Fig. 4C), where the potential selection is "Vanilla", which is a character strings

As per claim 6, Tidwell discloses:

- *wherein the created wizard is displayed* (column 5 line 37-39, " SmartGuide Driver

presenting a **graphical user interface** to the user based on instructions within the **SmartGuide**

Script"), where **Smartguide is the wizard** (column 2 line 52-54, "The **wizards, or**

SmartGuides as they are called when implemented using the script-like means of the present

invention").

As per claim 7 and 61, Tidwell discloses:

- *wherein the created wizard is displayed as sequential process steps with potential*

selections (column 5 line 37-39) and Figure 4A, 4B and 4C.

As per claim 8, Tidwell discloses:

- *wherein each of the plurality of sequential steps in a process is displayed concurrent*

with a single step and associated potential selections (Fig 4A, 4B and 4C).

As per claims 9, 10, 28, 29, 40, 41, 51 and 52, Tidwell discloses:

- *query and potential answers are prompted* (Fig 4B and 4C).

As per claim 11 and 30, Tidwell does not specifically disclose storing the created

wizard. However, Linnett discloses storing the created wizard (Figure 6 in 603 "**Save previous**

pages"), where the page is a **pagewizard** (column 3 line 12-13, "several user interface programs,

called **PageWizards**").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Linnett into the method of Tidwell to store the

created wizard. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art

would allow the third parties to extend and customize the feature of an existing tool (stored

wizard).

As per claim 12 and 31, Tidwell discloses:

 - *wizard is modifiable* (column 2 line 34-35, "It is yet another object of the present

invention to **enable users to modify a wizard**").

As per claim 13, 32, 42 and 53, Tidwell discloses:

 - *indicating one of machine and non-machine processing* (column 5 line 26-27, "A

method in a **computer system for enabling** a user to perform a task by a SmartGuide providing

direction to an application program"), where " a method in a computer system for enabling a

user" is considered as a **machine process** and (column 5 line 32-34, "SmartGuide Script created

using a discrete number of **English-readable commands** to present information to the user"),

where " **English-readable commands" is considered as non-machine process.**

As per claim 14, 33, 34, 43, 54 and 59 Tidwell discloses:

 - *input of information relating to the machine processing is prompted* (column 3 line

50-51, "SmartGuide scripts (209) are then created which execute in the memory") and (column 5

line 5-6, "FIG. 4C is a panel which presents the results of the information input to the

SmartGuide by the user"), where Smartguide is the wizard, which is executing inherently

including machine processing and prompting to the user.

As per claim 15 Tidwell discloses:

> *- created wizard sequentially conveys each of input process steps and prompts selections of a potential selection* (column 5 line 26-33).

As per claim 17, Tidwell discloses:

> *- created wizard sequentially displays each of the input process steps* (Fig 4A, 4B and 4C).

As per claim 19, Tidwell discloses:

> *- wherein conveyance of a process step is dependent upon a selection made in response to a previously conveyed process step* (Fig 4A, 4B and 4C), where <back> and <next> are considered as previous and next steps.

As per claim 20, Tidwell discloses:

> *- A wizard creator* (Abstract line 1-3, "A method and apparatus are provided whereby a person not familiar with programming or programming languages **can create a wizard**")

> *- a user interface* (Abstract line 3-4, "to **interface between** an application program **and the user**")

> *- adapted to prompt input of process steps* (column 6 line 21-22, "programmable means for said SmartGuides to **prompt said user for input**")

> *- potential selections associated with each of the process steps* (Fig 4A, 4B and 4C)

- *a memory* (column 3 line 50-51, "SmartGuide scripts (209) are then created which

execute in the **memory (201)**")

- *a processor* (column 3 line 37-38, "computer system containing a display device, a

processor and an input device")

- *create a wizard* (column 2 line 52-53, "The **wizards or SmartGuides** as they are called

when implemented using the script-like means").

Tidwell does not specifically disclose storing the input processes and output is based

upon input selections.

However Linnett discloses storing the input processes and created wizard is based upon

input selections (column 9 line 32-33, "**collecting user input relating to the specialized task** to

be performed") and (column 9 line 36-38, "selecting commands to effect the performance of the

specialized task by the application computer program **based on the collected user input**"),

where collecting user input relating to the specialized task is considered as **storing the input**

process and the performance of the socialized task is considered as the output which is based on

the collected input. The specialized task is performed by the interface program which is a wizard

is shown in (column 2 line 32-34, "It is another object of the present invention to provide an

interface program that has expert knowledge relating to the performance of a specialized task")

and (column 3 line 10-11, "**An interface program is referred to as a wizard**").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Linnett into the method of Tidwell to store

the input processes and create the output based upon the input. The modification would be

obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to provide an efficient tool and

allows third parties to extend and customize the feature of an existing application program

(column 2 line 28-30).

As per claims 21, 22 Tidwell discloses:

        - user interface and user interface is an integrated input and displayed (column

4 line 10-60).

As per claim 57, Tidwell discloses:

        - accessing prestored information and creating the wizard, at least in part, based upon

the prestored information (column 2 line 62-67, "the SmartGuides of the present invention

allow the user to customize the SmartGuide for their particular application .. modifying the

commands contained in the SmartGuide Script"), where modifying the commands contained in

the Smartguide script" inherently including accessing prestored information for customizing the

wizard.

        As per claim 65, Tidwell does not specifically disclose the plurality of languages.

However, in backgroud of the invention discloses the plurality of languages (column 2 line 12-

15, "wizards are traditionally written in programming languages such as C or C++. Since the

wizards are written in programming languages").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the background into the Tidwell to have

plurality of languages. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in

the art want to have different choices of language.

Claims 63-64 are rejected over Tidwell, II (Tidwell), US Patent No. 5,859,637 and

Linnett et al (Linnett), US Patent No. 5,301,326 and further in view of Batch et al (Batch), US

Patent No. 5423,023.

As per claim 63 and 64, neither Tidwell nor Linnett specifically disclose:

- information are stored in a state transition table. However, Batch disclose the

information are stored in a state transition table (column 4 line 67-68 and column 5 line 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Batch into the combined method of

Tidwell and Linnett to store the information in the state transition table. The modification would

be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to store the

information logically for operating and interacting the information with digital waveforms

(column 5 line 1-10).

Claims 3, 18, 23-25, 35, 38, 44-47, 49, 58, 60, 62 are rejected over Tidwell, II (Tidwell)

US Patent No. 5,859,637 and Linnett et al (Linnett), US Patent No. 5,301,326 and further in view

of Sonnenreich et al (Sonnenreich), US Patent No. 5,974,446.

As per claim 3, 18, 24, 25, 38 and 49, neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose:

prompting is audible. However, Sonnenreich discloses the prompting is audible (column 4 line 48-50, "As the audio plays through there will be numerous images and interactive demonstration that will appear on the user's screen").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sonnenreich into the combined method of Tidwell and Linnett to have audible prompting for the user. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to produce a sound allowing a user to send or receive information efficiently.

As per claim 23, neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose the user interface is a touch screen. However, Sonnenreich discloses the touch screen (column 10 line 5-7, "the user is now ready to select (G) the topic (subject) of interest on the main screen by "pressing" the appropriate button (i.e. mouse or **touch screen,** etc.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sonnenreich into the combined method of Tidwell and Linnett to have touch screen. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a system where the user can make a selection of the icon easily.

As per claim 35 and 62 neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose URL. *However, Sonnenreich discloses URL* (column 7 line 64, "Suitable types of the above are described in the following Web Page **URL references:**").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sonnenreich into the combined method of

Tidwell and Linnett to includes input of a URL. The modification would be obvious because one

of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to locate a resource (such as a file) from

anywhere in the Internet.

As per claim 44, **neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose** *propagated signal.* *However*

Sonnenreich discloses propagated signal (column 3 line 10-11, "university link-ups with **digital**

signal transmission are being tested").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sonnenreich into the combined method of

Tidwell and Linnett to propagate a signal. The modification would be obvious because one of

the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to transmit information to the user efficiently.

For the rest of the limitations see the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 45, 46 and 47, **neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose** *propagated signal is*

digital bit stream and carrier wave. *However Sonnenreich discloses propagated signal is*

digital bit stream and carrier wave (column 3 line 10-11, "university link-ups with **digital**

signal transmission are being tested").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sonnenreich into the combined method of

Tidwell and Linnett to propagate a signal. The modification would be obvious because one of

the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to transmit information to the user very distinctly

and clearly.

As per claims 58 and 60, neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose *database. However*

Sonnenreich discloses data bases (column 6 line 65-67, "the user screen topic "buttons" are

customized by the server to those topics of interest selected by the user and stored in said

database;"). Sonnenreich does not specifically disclose the database is relational. Official notice

is taken in relational data base is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to make the data base relational

because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to find information easily and

efficiently.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on 2/3/03 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

In the remark, the applicant has argued in substance:

(1)   Tidwell fails to teach the "prompting input of process steps and a plurality of

potential selections associated with the process steps" as recited in claims 1, 20 and 36.

Response:

(1)   As noted in the examiner rejection above, Tidwell discloses *prompting input of process*

step (column 6 line 21-22,"programmable means for said SmartGuides to *prompt said user for*

input"), where the SmartGuide is the wizard (column 2, lines 52" the wizards, or SmartGuide)

and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the process steps (column 4, lines

18-59, "Here's an entry field ... The <dataentry> fields create boxes for the user to enter input to

the application (409)"), where for each entry like "name", (which is a user input) is associated

with plurality of potential selections like "Chocolate", "Vanilla" and "Strawberry".

(2)   There is no existing motivation to combine the teachings of the Linnett patent with

the Tidwell patent. Particularly in light of the substantial difference between creating a

wizard script in the Tidwell patent and the use of a wizard as a user interface in the

program of the Linnett patent, there is no motivation to combine the two patents.

Response:

(2)   The examiner does not agree with the applicant. The examiner believes that both

Tidwell and Linnett patents are relevant. Tidwell patent discloses a method of creating a wizard

and an interaction between the wizard and the user (Tidwell, column 3, lines 20-65) and Linnett

patent discloses a method of using a wizard to interface between a user and an application

program (Linnett, column 3, lines 6-12).

As per claim 1, Tidwell fails to disclose storing the input processes and output is based upon the

input selections. Linnett patent overcomes this deficiency. Linnett discloses storing the input

processes and output is based upon the input selections (column 9, lines 32-33, "*collecting user*

input relating to the specialized task to be performed") and (column 9, lines 36-38, " selecting

commands to effect the performance of the *specialized task by the application program based*

on the collected user input"), where the "the specialized task" is the output, which is based on

the collected input. The specialized task is performed by the interface program which is a wizard

(column 3, lines 6-11). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in

the art would want to provide a method and system that allows a third parties to extend and

customize the feature of an existing application program (Linnett, column 2, lines 28-31).

The applicant fails to see that Linnett patent provides this motivation in (column 2 and lines 28-

31 "It is another object of the present invention to provide a method and system that allows third

parties to extend and customize the features of an existing application program"). *Thus the*

motivation existed and was established in the Linnett patent as described above.

(3)   Linnett patent does not teach "storing input process" as recited in claim 1.

Response:

(3)   As noted in the rejection above, Linnett discloses "collecting the user input relating to the

specialized task" (column 9, lines 32-33) and further in column 3, lines 15-21, Linnet discloses

Pagewizard collects formatting and date information from the user and interacts with the

publisher to effect the creation of a calender by Publisher. Linnett discloses the user navigates

through these *"page"* to input and view data (column 4, lines 20-24). It proves that Linnett

discloses storing the information of user input into the *"page". "Page" is considered as a*

mechanism to store data. Without storing the data or information, the wizard cannot create any

output like calender.

(4)   Linnett patent does not teach "storage means".

Response:

(4)   Claim 1 does not recite any "storage means" but "storing the input process" which was

taught by Linnett (see Response 3) and further Linnett discloses storage means (column 4, lines

2-25), where *"pages" are storage means where the user inputs are collected.*

(5)   Applicant has argued that claims 2, 4-15, 17, 19, 21-22, 26-34, 37, 39-43, are

allowable because they are dependent on claims 1, 20 and 36 respectively.

Response:

(5)   The independent claims 1, 20 and 36 are rejected over Tidwell patent in view of the

Linnett patent and all the dependent claims 2, 4-15, 17, 19, 21-22, 26-34, 37, 39-43 are rejected.

See the rejection above and the response of the applicant's argument.

(6)   Sonnenreich patent does not teach any method of wizard building. Applicant has

argued that the Sonnenreich patent fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Tidwell patent

in view of the Linnett patent for the claims 3, 18, 23-25, 35, 38, 44-47, 49, 58, 60 and 62. The

Examiner has failed to support his conclusion of obviousness with a "convincing line of

reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been

obvious in light of the teaching of the reference"

Response:

(6)   The examiner does not agree with the Applicant. Though Sonnenreich patent does not

disclose any method for wizard building but Sonnenreich patent discloses a user-friendly method

and a common user interface between a user and an application program (abstract, column 3,

lines 52-63) which is similar like Tidwell and Linnett patent because both of these two patents

disclose the user interface between a user and an application program via wizard. Therefore, the

examiner believes Sonnenreich patent is a relevant patent and overcome all the deficiencies of

the Tidwell and Linnett patents.

Sonnenreich patent overcomes all the deficiencies of the Tidwell patent in view of the Linnett

patent for the claims 3, 18, 23-25, 35, 38, 44-47, 49, 58, 60 and 62. The examiner has provided a

convincing reason for the motivation for each claim, see the rejection above.

(7)   Applicant has argued that Tidwell patent in view of the Linnett patent, further in

view of the Sonnenreich patent, fails to disclose, teach or make obvious Applicant's claim

44.

Response:

(7)   As noted in the office action above, claim 44 is rejected over Tidwell patent in view of

the Linnett patent, further in view of the Sonnenreich patent.   Claim 44 recites "propagated

signal". The other limitations are similar like claim 1 and rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

See the rejection of claim 1 in the office action above.

Neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose propagated signal as recited in claim 44. However,

Sonnenreich patent overcomes this deficiency (column 3, lines 10-11, link-ups with digital signal

transmission are being tested"). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary

skill in the art modification would be motivated to transmit the information to the user

efficiently.

(8)   Applicant has argued that Sonnenreich patent is unrelated.

Response:

(8)   The examiner does not agree with the Applicant. Examiner responsively chose the

Sonnenreich patent because it is related to the Tidwell and Linnett patent. Though Sonnenreich

patent does not disclose any method for wizard building but Sonnenreich patent discloses a user-

friendly method and a common user interface between a user and an application program

(Sonnenreich, abstract, column 3, lines 52-63) which is similar like Tidwell and Linnett patent

because these two patents disclose the user interface between a user and an application program .

Therefore, the examiner believes Sonnenreich patent is a relevant patent and overcome all the

deficiencies of the Tidwell and Linnett patents. See the office action above.

(9)   Applicant has argued that claims 45-54 are allowable because they depend from

claim 44 which is allowable. .

Response:

(9)   As noted in the rejection above, claim 44 is rejected over Tidwell and Lineett and further

in view of Sonnenreich and claims 45-54 rejected see the office action above.

(10) Claims 57-62 and 65 depend from claim 1 and allowable because Sonnenreich

patent fails to disclose, teach or make obvious claim 1.

Response:

(10) Examiner believes that Sonnenreich patent is a related patent which discloses the user

interface and the interaction between the user and an application program like Tidwell and

Linnett patent.

Claims 57-62 and 65 rejected over Tidwell patent in view of the Linnett patent, further in view of

the Sonnenreich patent, see the office action above.

(11) For claims 63-65, Applicant has argued that Batch patent does not overcome the

deficiencies of the Tidwell patent in view of Linnett patent.

Response:

(11) The examiner does not agree with the Applicant. Examiner believes that Batch patent is a

relevant patent which discloses a user configurable system which integrates and manages a

plurality of different task and software tool (wizard). The software tool (wizard) receives inputs

and provides outputs (Batch, Abstract, lines 1-2 and column 37, lines 17-20) like Tidwell and

Linnett patent.

As noted in the office action above, claims 63 and 64 are rejected over Tidwell patent and

Linnett patent and further in view of Batch. Examiner believes that Batch patent overcomes the

deficiencies of the Tidwell patent in view of Linnett patent.

Neither Tidwell nor Linnett disclose "Information are stored in a state transition table" However,

Batch discloses "Information are stored in a state transition table" (column 4, lines 67-68 and

column 5, lines 1-7, "The graphic wave forms or related **inputs,** *tables* **are** *provided which*

define the various digital states for waveforms to by inputted and which define logic rules for

operating on or interacting with such waveforms. Use inputted, generated or default waveform

displays may be displayed utilizing the **stored** *digital state information* and commands from

various source may be executed of the waveform or other graphics, utilizing, as required, the

stored defined states and logic rules"), where the inputs are stored in the tables which define

various *digital state information* is *the state transition table.* The modification would be

obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to store the information

logically for operating and interacting the information with digital waveforms (related inputs)

(Batch, column 5, lines 1-10).

Conclusion

7.   Thus, the rejection of the claims over the prior art in the previous office action is

maintained (see paper # 7) and **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of

the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is 703-305-1339.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor Greg Morse can be reached at 703-308-4789. The fax number for this group   are:

(703) 746-7239 (official fax), (703) 746-7240 (non-official/draft), (703)746-7238 (after final).

An inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be

directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Chameli C. Das

Chameli C. Das

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2122

3/12/03